1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 KEVIN LAMAR FRAZIER, 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-05-0774 MCE JFM P 12 VS. 13 SPENCER ROWELL, et al., 14 Defendants. **ORDER** 15 On October 20, 2006, defendant Spencer Rowell¹ filed a motion for summary 16 17 judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion. 18 Local Rule 78-230(m) provides in part: "Failure of the responding party to file 19 written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the granting of the motion " On July 8, 2005, plaintiff was advised of the 20 requirements for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may 21 22 be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion. 23 Local Rule 11-110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules "may be 24 grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the 25 26 ¹ Defendant Rowell is the only defendant in this action. (See Order filed July 8, 2005.)

Case 2:05-cv-00774-MCE-JFM Document 44 Filed 11/30/06 Page 2 of 2

inherent power of the Court." In the order filed July 8, 2005, plaintiff was advised that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any he has, to the motion for summary judgment or a statement of non-opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

7 DATED: November 29, 2006.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

fraz0774.46osc